

Quantum gates by reverse engineering of a Hamiltonian

Alan C. Santos^{1,*}

¹*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal Fluminense,
Av. Gal. Milton Tavares de Souza s/n, Gragoatá, 24210-346 Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
(Dated: January 17, 2017)*

Reverse engineering of Hamiltonian (REH) from an evolution operator is an useful technique for protocols of quantum control with potential applications to quantum information processing. In this paper we introduce a particular protocol to perform REH and we show as this scheme can be used to perform universal quantum computing by using minimal quantum resources (such as entanglement, interactions between more than two qubits or auxiliary qubits). Remarkable, while previous protocol requires three-qubits interactions and auxiliary qubits to implement such gates, our protocol requires just two-qubit interactions and no additional resource. We apply our results to show as implement the quantum Fourier transform (QFT) motivated by its applicability to Shor's algorithm. By using this approach, we can obtain a large class of Hamiltonians that allow us implement single and two-qubit gates necessary in subroutines of quantum circuits of quantum algorithms as, for example, the Shor's algorithm.

I. INTRODUCTION

Currently, protocol of quantum control with time-dependent Hamiltonians, as adiabatic passage [1], Lewis-Riesenfeld invariants [2, 3], transitionless quantum driving (TQD) [4–6] and the current propose of REH from unitary evolutions operators [7], has play an important role in quantum information processing (see Ref. [8] for a review of many applications of this three first techniques). In addition, in the last years, many experimental and theoretical studies has been performed in order to analyze the robustness of such protocols against decoherence effects [9–12].

Remarkable, in quantum computation (QC) and information these techniques provides Hamiltonians able to solve satisfiability problems [13], or to introduce new hybrid models of QC. In fact, through quantum control protocols we can obtain controllable time-dependent Hamiltonians to implement single and controlled quantum gates. For example, quantum gates of a circuit can be implemented via adiabatic Hamiltonians [14, 15] or via its superadiabatic counterpart [16–18]. However, these schemes requires auxiliary qubits in order to can implement *universal* QC. We say *universal* in sense that, given an unknown input state, we should be able to implement any single- and two-qubit quantum gate on this qubit. In general, the Hamiltonians that implements an adiabatic dynamics, as well as superadiabatic Hamiltonian and those provided by REH, must evolves the system from initial state that is eigenstate of the adiabatic Hamiltonian. Thus, sometimes, such Hamiltonians must be highly degenerate [16, 17] and so we can encode any unknown state in the initial state of the system. Consequently, ancilla qubits are necessities. On the other hand, even when we have ancilla qubits available, when we want implement two-qubit quantum gates the problem of many bodies interactions must be highlight. In fact, in general we need interactions between the qubits of our target system as well as between the target system and the ancilla qubits, such that sometimes interactions of three (or more) qubits is

required [14–17].

In this paper we introduce a alternative way to perform universal QC based on REH from evolution operators. Differently from methods developed recently for REH, our approach is independent of the initial state of the system and, therefore, ancilla qubits is not necessary in our scheme. In the section II we discuss the general aspects of our approach and we show as obtain a set of Hamiltonian which allow us implement the quantum gates of a quantum circuit. Because our approach is independent of initial state, while many protocols requires auxiliary qubits to perform universal QC, our approach need not help of auxiliary elements to implement single and controlled quantum gates. In this sense, the scheme present here is an enhanced way to implement quantum gates. In the section III we illustrate the results obtained here through the Shor's algorithm [19] which make uses of QFT as subroutines of such algorithm [20, 21].

II. QUANTUM GATES BY REVERSE ENGINEERING OF A HAMILTONIAN

Let us start by considering the Schrödinger equation (we set $\hbar = 1$ throughout the manuscript)

$$H(t)|\psi(t)\rangle = i|\dot{\psi}(t)\rangle, \quad (1)$$

such that the dynamics is unitary and, therefore, there are an operator $U(t)$ where we can write $|\psi(t)\rangle = U(t)|\psi(0)\rangle$. From equation above (valid for any $|\psi(0)\rangle$), the Hamiltonian reads as

$$H(t) = i\dot{U}(t)U^\dagger(t), \quad (2)$$

which is a way so-known to obtain the Hamiltonian associate with evolution operator $U(t)$. In general, this equation is the starting point in protocols of reverse engineering in closed quantum systems [7, 22, 23], as well as transitionless quantum driving [4–6, 8]. The operator $U(t)$ can be defined of many different way, but there are properties that such operator must satisfy, namely, the unitary condition ($U(t)U^\dagger(t) = \mathbb{1}$)

* ac_santos@id.uff.br

and $U(0) = \mathbb{1}$. Let us now use these conditions to define the operator $U(t)$ as

$$U(t) = \sum_n e^{i\varphi_n(t)} |n(t)\rangle \langle n(t)|, \quad (3)$$

where $|n(t)\rangle$ constitutes an orthonormal bases for the Hilbert space associated with the system and $\varphi_n(t)$ are real free parameters. It is easy show that $U(t)$, defined above, satisfies the unitarity condition $U(t)U^\dagger(t) = \mathbb{1}$ for any set of parameters $\varphi_n(t)$, but the imposition $U(0) = \mathbb{1}$ restricts the initial values of $\varphi_n(t)$ and it must comply with the condition $\varphi_n(0) = 2n\pi$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Differently from others protocols [1–7], the definition of the operator $U(t)$ can not be view as an operator that drives the system from initial state $|n(0)\rangle$ to $|n(T)\rangle$. This subtle difference characterizes the present protocol as an alternative to each others schemes. Moreover, as we shall see, this approach can be useful in some protocols of quantum information processing, such as implementing universal QC using minimal resource, for example.

A. Single-qubit gates

In this section we will show, without additional resources, which single quantum gates can be implemented by using the scheme presented here. To this end, we start by considering that a single-qubit gate can be view as a linear transformation on an arbitrary quantum state $|\psi_{\text{inp}}\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$, and so let us consider the transformation $|\psi(t)\rangle = U_1(t)|\psi_{\text{inp}}\rangle$, where the operator $U_1(t)$ is given by

$$U_1(t) = |n_+(t)\rangle \langle n_+(t)| + e^{i\varphi(t)} |n_-(t)\rangle \langle n_-(t)|, \quad (4)$$

where

$$|n_+(t)\rangle = \cos \theta(t) |0\rangle + e^{i\phi(t)} \sin \theta(t) |1\rangle, \quad (5)$$

$$|n_-(t)\rangle = -\sin \theta(t) |0\rangle + e^{i\phi(t)} \cos \theta(t) |1\rangle, \quad (6)$$

with $\theta(t)$, $\varphi(t)$ and $\phi(t)$ being real free parameters. It is easy show that the conditions $U_1(t)U_1^\dagger(t) = \mathbb{1}$ and $U_1(0) = \mathbb{1}$ are satisfied if we choose $\varphi(t)$ such that $\varphi(0) = 2n\pi$, for integers n . The parameters associated with the quantum gate to be implemented are encoded into parameters $\theta(t)$, $\varphi(t)$ and $\phi(t)$. To show that we can really implement single-qubit gates by using the operator $U_1(t)$, let us consider the evolved state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ given by

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = U_1(t)|\psi_{\text{inp}}\rangle = \alpha(t)|0\rangle + \beta(t)|1\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where the coefficients $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ are given, respectively by

$$\alpha(t) = \frac{a\sigma_+(t)}{2} - \frac{\sigma_-(t)[a \cos \theta(t) + b e^{-i\phi(t)} \sin \theta(t)]}{2} \quad (8)$$

$$\beta(t) = \frac{b\sigma_+(t)}{2} + \frac{\sigma_-(t)[b \cos \theta(t) - a e^{i\phi(t)} \sin \theta(t)]}{2} \quad (9)$$

with $\sigma_\pm(t) = (e^{i\varphi(t)} \pm 1)$. By using the initial condition $\varphi(0) = 2n\pi$ we can see that $\alpha(0) = a$ and $\beta(0) = b$, because $\sigma_\pm(0) = 2\delta_{\pm,0}$. Therefore, from Eqs. (7-9), an arbitrary single-qubit rotation can be performed.

Notice that the evolution operator is not ψ_{inp} -independent, in sense that we do not need to know any information about the state $|\psi_{\text{inp}}\rangle$ to use the method. Therefore, the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ associate with operator $U(t)$ is also ψ_{inp} -independent. Thus, single-qubit universal operations can be performed by using this approach, where no additional quantum resource (such as entanglement or auxiliary qubits, for example) is required.

B. Two-qubit quantum gates

To show that our protocol can be used to implement universal QC, we must show as implement two-qubit quantum gates through it. By writing a two-qubit input state in its most general form as $|\psi_{\text{inp},2}\rangle = a|00\rangle + b|01\rangle + c|10\rangle + d|11\rangle$ and by defining the operator

$$U_2(t) = \sum_{k=1,2} |n_{k,+}(t)\rangle \langle n_{k,+}(t)| + e^{i\varphi_k(t)} |n_{k,-}(t)\rangle \langle n_{k,-}(t)|, \quad (10)$$

where we set (with $\bar{k} = k - 1$)

$$|n_{k,+}(t)\rangle = \cos \theta_k(t) |\bar{k}0\rangle + e^{i\phi_k(t)} \sin \theta_k(t) |\bar{k}1\rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$|n_{k,-}(t)\rangle = -\sin \theta_k(t) |\bar{k}0\rangle + e^{i\phi_k(t)} \cos \theta_k(t) |\bar{k}1\rangle, \quad (12)$$

with the initial conditions $\varphi_1(0) = \varphi_2(0) = 2n\pi$ (due the requirement $U_2(0) = \mathbb{1}$). Now we have six free parameters and we need set them in order to obtain the expected result at the end of the dynamics. The operator $U_2(t)$ is a general transform of two-qubit state and, by adjusting adequately our free parameters, $U_2(t)$ can be an entangled gate or only a composition of two independent single-qubits gates (i.e., $U_2(t) = A_1(t) \otimes A_2(t)$). In order to analyze some results by using its most general form, we keep our discussion without consider some particular case for $U_2(t)$, but particularizations for $U_2(t)$ will be done in the section III.

From Eqs. (10-12) we can write the evolved state as

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{\text{inp},2}\rangle &= U_2(t)|\psi_{\text{inp},2}\rangle \\ &= \alpha(t)|00\rangle + \beta(t)|10\rangle + \gamma(t)|01\rangle + \delta(t)|11\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

with the following coefficients

$$\alpha(t) = \frac{a\sigma_{1,+}(t) - \sigma_{1,-}(t)[a \cos \theta_1(t) + b e^{i\phi_1(t)} \sin \theta_1(t)]}{2}, \quad (14)$$

$$\beta(t) = \frac{b\sigma_{1,+}(t) + \sigma_{1,-}(t)[b \cos \theta_1(t) - a e^{-i\phi_1(t)} \sin \theta_1(t)]}{2}, \quad (15)$$

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{c\sigma_{2,+}(t) - \sigma_{2,-}(t)[c \cos \theta_2(t) + d e^{i\phi_2(t)} \sin \theta_2(t)]}{2}, \quad (16)$$

$$\delta(t) = \frac{d\sigma_{2,+}(t) + \sigma_{2,-}(t)[d \cos \theta_2(t) - c e^{-i\phi_2(t)} \sin \theta_2(t)]}{2}, \quad (17)$$

where again we have defined $\sigma_{k,\pm}(t) = (e^{i\varphi_k(t)} \pm 1)$, such that $\sigma_{k,\pm}(0) = 2\delta_{\pm,\mp}$. As in the case of single-qubit gate, the operator $U_2(t)$, as well as the Hamiltonian associate to $U_2(t)$, is ψ_{inp} -independent.

In this discussion we have not labeled a target and control qubit and this choice can be done through the definition of the free parameters. Thus, the operator $U_2(t)$ encompasses a

large class of two-qubit gates, like entangling quantum gates (as CNOT or some controlled single-qubit unitary rotations) or non-entangling gates (such as the SWAP gate).

III. UNIVERSAL SET OF QUANTUM GATES AND QUANTUM FOURIER TRANSFORM

In order to show as we can to implement a set of universal quantum gates by using the results developed here, in this section we consider, without losses generality, some choices for the free parameters previously discussed. As application of this method, we discuss about the set of quantum gates necessary to implement the quantum Fourier transform [20], which has an immediate application to the Shor's algorithm [19].

A. Quantum gates for (approximately) universal QC

In this section we provides a set of choices of the free parameters of our approach which allow us implement an universal set of quantum gates composed by phase shift gates, Hadamard gate and CNOT gate that may be used to perform universal QC with arbitrary efficiency [20, 24].

For phase shift gates, given any entry $|\psi_{\text{inp}}\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ we have the corresponding output $|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = a|0\rangle + e^{i\xi}b|1\rangle$, for any value $0 < \xi < 2\pi$. Thus, from Eqs. (8) and (9), such a gate may be implemented if we choose $\varphi(T) = \xi$ and $\theta(T) = 0$. Notice that we have boundary conditions for the parameter $\varphi(t)$ given by $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(T) = \xi$, so $\varphi(t)$ can not assume any form. On the other hand, the parameter $\theta(t)$ has a single condition that must be satisfied, where such a condition can be obtained setting $\theta(t) = 0$. Moreover, we can use it as a free parameter in order to simplify the Hamiltonian that evolves the system. In fact, putting $\theta(t) = 0$ the Hamiltonian for phase shift gates is given by (in order to obtain simple Hamiltonians, throughout the manuscript we consider that the system evolves up to a global phase)

$$H_{\text{ph}}(t) = \frac{\dot{\varphi}(t)}{2} \sigma_z, \quad (18)$$

where $\sigma_z = \text{diag}[1, -1]$ is the Pauli matrix and the symbol “ $\cdot$ ” denotes temporal derivatives. This choice is not unique and we can have many others possibilities if we set $\theta(t) \neq 0$, but if we pick $\theta(t) \neq 0$ the corresponding Hamiltonian may be not as simple as the Hamiltonian obtained above.

The Hadamard gate is an exclusive gate of quantum computers due its ability of generating quantum superpositions with elements of the computational basis. More specifically, given a quantum state $|\psi_{\text{inp}}\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$ we have its corresponding output $|\psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = (a+b)/\sqrt{2}|0\rangle + (a-b)/\sqrt{2}|1\rangle$. We can implement such operation by setting $\theta(T) = \pi/4$, $\phi(T) = 0$ and $\varphi(T) = \pi$. In this case, we have only one free parameter, namely, $\phi(t)$ and so we consider $\phi(t) = 0$ in order to simplify the Hamiltonian given by

$$H_{\text{Had}}(t) = \frac{\dot{\varphi}(t)}{2\sqrt{2}} (\sigma_z + \sigma_x). \quad (19)$$

Finally, let us discuss about implementation of the CNOT gate. Without loss of generality, we consider a bipartite system initially in the state

$$|\psi_{\text{inp},2}\rangle = a|0\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + b|0\rangle_c|1\rangle_t + c|1\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + d|1\rangle_c|1\rangle_t \quad (20)$$

where the subscript “c” and “t” labels the control and target qubit, respectively. Thus, under this encoding the state of the system at end of the evolution must be written as

$$|\psi_{\text{out},2}\rangle = a|0\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + b|0\rangle_c|1\rangle_t + \gamma(T)|1\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + \delta(T)|1\rangle_c|1\rangle_t \quad (21)$$

where $\gamma(t)$ and $\delta(t)$ are given by the Eqs. (16) and (17), respectively. Notice that the coefficients a and b were not changed, therefore, from Eqs. (14) and (15) we must set $\varphi_1(t) = 0$. With this choice, the parameters $\theta_1(t)$ and $\phi_1(t)$ becomes additional free parameters that may be used to simplify the Hamiltonian. In addition, to obtain the CNOT operation rightly, we need choose our parameter such that $\gamma(T) = d$ and $\delta(T) = c$. Therefore, from Eqs. (16) and (17), this result can be achieve from the choices $\theta_2(T) = \pi/2$, $\varphi_2(T) = \pi$ and $\phi_2(T) = 0$.

B. Application to quantum Fourier transform

Now, let us discuss the applicability of our approach to implement the discrete quantum Fourier transform (QFT). This example is considered a good example due the connection of the QFT with the Shor's algorithm [19, 20]. To implement the quantum circuit for QFT we need of Hadamard, controlled phase shift gates in addition with the SWAP gate [20]. The Hadamard gate was discussed in the previous section, therefore we will discuss about controlled phase shift and SWAP gate.

Let us start from Eq. (21) to discuss the controlled phase shift gate. As in the case of the CNOT gate, here we will consider our bipartite system as given by the Eq. (20) and the final state given by Eq. (21), however, here we need satisfy $\gamma(T) = c$ and $\delta(T) = e^{i\xi}d$. Now, the choice of the free parameters necessary to achieve this result might be $\theta_2(T) = 0$, $\varphi_2(T) = \xi$, $\varphi_1(T) = 0$ and $\phi_2(T) = 0$. Under this considerations, we can set $\phi_2(t) = \theta_2(t) = 0$ and the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H(t) = \frac{\dot{\varphi}_2(t)}{4} [\mathbb{1}_c \otimes \sigma_{zt} + \sigma_{zc} \otimes \mathbb{1}_t - \sigma_{zc} \otimes \sigma_{zt}], \quad (22)$$

where the parameter $\theta_1(t)$ has not any relevance because we put $\varphi_1(t) = 0$. The Hamiltonian above is the more simple Hamiltonian that we can obtain with this method, but is not unique and can assume others form from different choices of the parameters $\phi_2(t)$ and $\theta_2(t)$.

By considering the state $|\psi_{\text{inp},2}\rangle$, the SWAP gate implement the exchange $b \rightarrow c$ and $c \rightarrow b$. However, such a change is not possible from Eqs. (14-17) and we need redefine our scheme. For this particular case of the SWAP gate, we redefine the states $|n_{k,\pm}(t)\rangle$ of the following way

$$|n_{1,+}(t)\rangle = \cos \theta_k(t)|00\rangle + e^{i\phi_k(t)} \sin \theta_k(t)|11\rangle, \quad (23)$$

$$|n_{1,-}(t)\rangle = -\sin \theta_k(t)|00\rangle + e^{i\phi_k(t)} \cos \theta_k(t)|11\rangle, \quad (24)$$

$$|n_{2,+}(t)\rangle = \cos \theta_k(t)|01\rangle + e^{i\phi_k(t)} \sin \theta_k(t)|10\rangle, \quad (25)$$

$$|n_{2,-}(t)\rangle = -\sin \theta_k(t)|01\rangle + e^{i\phi_k(t)} \cos \theta_k(t)|10\rangle, \quad (26)$$

where the coefficients given in the Eqs. (14-17) becomes

$$\alpha(t) = \frac{a\sigma_{1,+}(t) - \sigma_{1,-}(t)[a \cos \theta_1(t) + de^{i\phi_1(t)} \sin \theta_1(t)]}{2}, \quad (27)$$

$$\beta(t) = \frac{b\sigma_{2,+}(t) + \sigma_{2,-}(t)[b \cos \theta_2(t) - ce^{-i\phi_2(t)} \sin \theta_1(t)]}{2}, \quad (28)$$

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{c\sigma_{2,+}(t) - \sigma_{2,-}(t)[c \cos \theta_2(t) + be^{i\phi_2(t)} \sin \theta_2(t)]}{2}, \quad (29)$$

$$\delta(t) = \frac{d\sigma_{1,+}(t) + \sigma_{1,-}(t)[d \cos \theta_1(t) - ae^{-i\phi_1(t)} \sin \theta_1(t)]}{2}. \quad (30)$$

Therefore, now the new coefficients allow us make the exchange $b \rightarrow c$ and $c \rightarrow b$. By considering $\varphi_1(t) = 0$ we guarantee that $\alpha(t) = a$ and $\delta(t) = d$ that is a requirement of the SWAP gate. Finally, if we put $\theta_2(T) = \pi/2$, $\varphi_2(T) = \pi$ and $\phi(T) = 0$, we drive the system from the $|\psi_{in,2}\rangle = a|0\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + b|0\rangle_c|1\rangle_t + c|1\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + d|1\rangle_c|1\rangle_t$ to the final state $|\psi_{in,2}\rangle = a|0\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + c|0\rangle_c|1\rangle_t + b|1\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + d|1\rangle_c|1\rangle_t$.

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, in this paper we have introduced a scheme to perform universal QC via reverse engineering of a Hamiltonian from the evolution operator. We discuss the general aspects of our approach and show as obtain a set of Hamiltonian that allow us implement an universal set of quantum gates. Our method is an economic scheme that can be view as an alternative to others method present in the literature. In fact, while many protocols requires auxiliary qubits to perform universal QC, our approach does not need help of auxiliary elements to implement single and controlled quantum gates, because the method presented here is independent of

the initial state of the system. We illustrate the results obtained here through the Shor's algorithm that makes uses of QFT as subroutines of such algorithm. While the first purpose to implement QFT, from adiabatic dynamics using controlled quantum evolution, requires three-qubits interactions [15, 21], our protocol requires just two-qubit interactions. By using this approach, we can obtain a large class of Hamiltonians to implement single and two-qubit gates, therefore this method can be a useful technique to perform universal QC in many physical systems.

When the inevitable interaction of our system with the external medium (reservoir) is considered, decoherence effects may be a big problem and this problems increases with number of particles in our system. On the other hand, large-scale quantum computing requires the manipulation of many qubits that remaining with a good robustness against decoherence effects. In this scenario, the scheme presented here may be more robust to decoherence than the protocols that requires auxiliary qubits, already we do not need auxiliary qubits and, consequently, the error produced by such qubits is removed here. It would be interesting to make this analysis in order to comparative this scheme with others known protocols. Other interesting point is the energetic resource to implement this protocol. Can we optimize it, for example, from additional free parameters? If we can, how can we? We leave these as open problems for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge financial support from the Brazilian agencies CNPq and the Brazilian National Institute of Science and Technology for Quantum Information (INCT-IQ). Specially, we would like to thank to Natanael Moura from Universidade Regional do Cariri for useful discussions.

-
- [1] U. Gaubatz, P. Rudecki, S. Schieman and K. Bergmann, *J. Chem. Phys.* **92**, 5363. (1990).
 - [2] H. R. Lewis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **18**, 510 (1967).
 - [3] H. R. Lewis and W. B. Riesenfeld, *J. Math. Phys.* **10**, 1458 (1969).
 - [4] M. Demirplak and S. A. Rice, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **107**, 9937 (2003).
 - [5] M. Demirplak and S. A. Rice, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **109**, 6838 (2005).
 - [6] M. V. Berry, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **42**, 365303 (2009).
 - [7] Yi-Hao Kang *et al*, *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 30151 (2016).
 - [8] E. Torrontegui *et al*, *Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **62**, 117 (2013).
 - [9] A. M. Childs, E. Farhi, J. Preskill, *Phys Rev A*, **65**, 012322 (2001).
 - [10] M. H. S. Amin, D. V. Averin and J. A. Nesteroff *Phys Rev A*, **79**, 022107 (2009).
 - [11] Y.-X. Du *et al*, *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 12479 (2016).
 - [12] S. An, D. Lv, A. del Campo and K. Kim, *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 12999 (2016).
 - [13] E. Farhi *et al*, *Science* **292**, 472 (2001).
 - [14] D. Bacon, S. T. Flammia, *Phys Rev Lett.* **103**, 120504 (2009).
 - [15] I. Hen, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 022309 (2015).
 - [16] A. C. Santos and M. S. Sarandy, *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 15775 (2015).
 - [17] A. C. Santos, R. D. Silva and M. S. Sarandy, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 012311 (2016).
 - [18] I. B. Coulamy, A. C. Santos, I. Hen and M. S. Sarandy, *Front. ICT* **3**, 19 (2016).
 - [19] P. W. Shor, *Proceedings of the 35th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 124 (1994).
 - [20] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2000).
 - [21] I. Hen, *Front. Phys.* **2**, 44 (2014).
 - [22] M. Herrera, M. S. Sarandy, E. I. Duzzioni and R. M. Serra, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 022323 (2014).
 - [23] J. Jing, L.-A. Wu, M. S. Sarandy and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 053422 (2013).
 - [24] A. Barenco *et al*, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 3457 (1995).